REMARKS

This amendment and the accompanying RCE are being filed in response to the Advisory Action mailed November 29, 2005. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment filed on November 15, 2005 would not be entered as the amendment to claim 22 raised new issues which would require further search and/or consideration. With the submission of this RCE, applicants are requesting entry of the previously submitted amendment.

With this amendment, Applicants are further amending claim 22 to recite that the polymer film on the base ply is a protective film which reduces corrosion of the base ply. In the Advisory Action mailed November 29, 2005, the Examiner indicated that while applicants argued that Linska does not teach or suggest a polymeric film for the purpose of reducing corrosion, this argument is not commensurate in scope with the claims. Accordingly, Applicants have further amended claim 22 to make this distinction.

With regard to claim 21, the Examiner asserted in the Advisory Action that Linska's adhesive laminate comprising polymeric adhesive layers on either side of a foil is equivalent to applicants' claimed multi-layer laminate. The Examiner asserts that the metal foil is "understood to be the corrosion-inhibiting additive" and is understood to be "'thereon' the polymeric adhesive layers," reasoning that this interpretation is consistent with applicants' disclosure at page 6 of the specification. Applicants strongly disagree. Applicants' specification clearly teaches that the multi-layer laminate comprises two or more polymer layers with a **polymer film** layer therebetween which has corrosion inhibiting additives impregnated into the film or incorporated into the polymer emulsion which forms the polymer film. See the specification at page 6. Nowhere do applicants teach that a metal foil may be used as a corrosion-inhibiting additive. Nor does Linska teach or suggest a polymer film containing corrosion inhibiting additives **within** the film as taught and claimed by applicants.

With regard to Takemura, the Examiner maintains his position that Takemura's anticorrosive tape for use on piping would be capable of reducing corrosion and abrasion of printing blankets/cylinders when used on a printing blanket construction. Applicants disagree.

Takemura's tape structure does not anticipate the claimed multi-layer laminate as Takemura does not teach or suggest a multi-layer laminate which comprises two or more polymers with a **polymeric film** layer **therebetween**. While the Examiner asserts that the rust prevention agent of Takemura would penetrate the base fabric layer, applicants wish to point out that the middle polymeric layer of their laminate is **non-permeable**. See Fig. 2, the specification at page 5, lines 12-13, and amended claim 21. And, as pointed out above, applicants' corrosion inhibiting agents are incorporated into the film itself by impregnation or by incorporation into the polymeric emulsion. Takemura clearly does not teach or suggest the claimed construction, and therefore could not be expected to provide protection against corrosion and abrasion as claimed.

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that claims 2, 4-9, and 21-22, as amended, are patentable over the cited prior art. Early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

By Susan M. Luna
Susan M. Luna
Registration No. 38,769

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6429
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405

SML/